

**Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Novato Police Station Meeting Room
Novato, California
October 12, 2005**

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Lance McMahan; Theresa McGarry , Jim McAlister; Jeff Johnston; Matthew McCarron; Marucia Britto; Sue Lattanzio; Preston Cook.

RAB Members Absent:

Manuel Mier; Ross Millerick; William McNicholas; Naomi Feger; Laurent Meillier; Patricia Eklund, Richard A. Draeger

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Cara Naiditch; Travis Williamson; Jim Davies; Tom Gandesbery; John Kowalczyk, Eric Bayer

Welcoming Remarks

Matthew McCarron welcomed the community to the October 12, 2005 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:10 p.m.

Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Update- Jim McAlister, USACE

In September the Army performed quarterly monitoring of the gas probes at Landfill 26 and also performed the annual groundwater and soil monitoring. GNP 9 was the only area where the methane concentration was greater than 0.1 percent. The reading from GNP 9 on the landfill side of the vent trench is 8 percent methane, which is considered normal during summer months. The Army was unable to get a reading from GNP 5 or GNP 30. However, Title 27 says that monitoring should take place every 1,000 feet around the landfill, so the Army does not take readings from every gas probe.

Jeff Johnston: Is there a degradation process associated with the methane, and is there a timeline where the methane disappears?

Jim McAlister: Methane is produced by organic material degrading. A typical municipal landfill has a methane production curve. In this case, most of the organic material is naturally occurring, due to the location of the Pacheco stream bed. The San Francisco Bay used to be located between Ammo Hill and Reservoir Hill. I don't know the degradation rate of an organic stream bed. The methane was found to be 300-800 years old, and we don't know when methane in this area will go away.

Jeff Johnston: To what extent do the residents need to worry and what is the potential for development in the landfill property?

Jim McAlister: The property still belongs to the Army, and the Army has no plans to develop it. At one time, in the master plan for Hamilton, the City was planning on taking the property over. I do not know what would be involved in the title transfer. The Department of Defense looks at Department of Defense contamination, and it is our position that the methane out here is naturally occurring; therefore there is nothing we can do about it. Shea Homes put in mitigation measures, per Title 27, for houses that are located near the higher concentrations of methane. Marin County Health Services is aware of the situation and they accompany the monitor working for Shea Homes.

Marucia Britto: How do the readings this year compare with the readings from last year?

Jim McAlister: They are following the same pattern. Concentrations are often higher in the summer months.

Theresa McGarry: The California Waste Management Board is overseeing the cleanup on the landfill. My understanding is that Shea Homes has been working with the local environmental health department to monitor for methane on Hamilton Meadows. There is some elevated methane deep in the soil on Shea properties. The Army has provided convincing evidence that the methane is naturally occurring. We will be writing to the local health officers to inform them of the situation. Nobody is saying that it is a health threat, but it does need to be monitored and people need to be informed.

Jim McAlister: Our position is that the methane comes from deposits of organic material within the soil.

Matthew McCarron: Is it a requirement and/or do you test for other volatile chemicals (VOCs)?

Jim McAlister: Yes, it is a requirement. There were 53 soil gas samples taken for VOC analysis and mixed gas. The results of those samples have not been returned. On Hamilton Meadows we did a risk assessment. We took VOC samples and sent them off to the lab and it was determined that the methane was not a risk to the public. We have done four quarters of verification sampling, and the risk has been further reduced.

Eric Bayer: I am thinking about purchasing a house in the area, and so I have some questions. Can you tell me about the landfill?

Jim McAlister: Hamilton was established in the late 1930s, and some time after that the Army started dumping construction debris, metals, and some industrial items. We also found some diesel contaminated soils. There is no liner underneath the landfill, but there is a layer of clay and 40mil plastic liner that covers the entire landfill. The refuse averages about 7 feet in thickness. Groundwater flow is from south to north. When the methane was first detected above 5 percent, we put the trench in. Subsequently we did an investigation to figure out where the methane was coming from and everything seemed to point to a naturally occurring condition from the organics in the soil.

Eric Bayer: How high is the cap relative to the houses?

Jim McAlister: The cap is elevated on the west end side with a perimeter ditch surrounding it.

Eric Bayer: How high is the water table?

Jim McAlister: The water table is about 5 feet from the surface. The soils are moist.

Eric Bayer: What is the relationship between the plume and the trench?

Jim McAlister: MTBE dissolves into the water. All of the Navy's remediation efforts are further to the south. We took the MTBE plume into consideration when we were designing the soil gas probes. We have sections of discontinuous trenches due to the concrete dams that were put in, so that we do not get flow from the plume into the trench.

The Navy has determined that there is not a threat to human health from VOCs in the area and DTSC concurred with that position. They recommended four quarters of sampling, and the results have been given to DTSC to review.

There are Board Orders against the Army on Landfill 26. The Army has prepared responses to comments on the Work Plan and these responses have been sent to the Water Board. The Army is scheduled to go to a health conference on November 1st, 2005.

Upcoming Events

- Various Monitoring Reports under review by agencies.
- RWQCB in process of revising board orders

The waste discharge requirements are being updated, and the Board Order is being reviewed to include a decision document which will be issued January/February 2006 timeline. There will be no enforcement on the December 30, 2005 deadline in anticipation of the new Board Order coming out which will have specific deadline dates.

Eric Bayer: Have you detected any MTBE in the trench?

Jim McAlister: Under CERCLA, this was considered a removal action. Until we have the final decision document, it isn't considered remedial action. The trench itself is a removal action. Its purpose is to take any soil gas that may be going along horizontally in the ground and putting it into the air. It does nothing for MTBE. We don't have test boards in the trench itself. We have groundwater wells in the area, and the gas monitoring probes go down into groundwater. The Navy monitors many of the probes to help define the extent of the plume.

Sue Lattanzio: Are the work plan and the regional board's comments available for review?

Jim McAlister: I sent a cd, and they were also sent to the library. They also might post the comments on the website. Please call Laurent for more information.

North Antenna Field

The Army did a draft Final Risk Assessment and sent it to the agencies for review. The agencies had extensive comments, and the Army had to write a new contract to get those comments addressed. We are hoping for award of the contract by the end of this month, and those responses should be available December 2005. After the agencies review the responses, the Army will have a response to comment meeting and we are hoping to incorporate their comments and have the Final Risk Assessment by March 2006.

The Army will have the feasibility study out by August 2006, and after that the Decision Document, design and remedial action will follow.

Navy Update – Travis Williamson, Navy BRAC PMO West consultant

NEX Gas Station

The property where the NEX gas station is located is currently referred to as Hamilton Square and has been transferred to a developer via public sale. There are some properties that the Navy still owns that are referred to as Public Benefit Conveyance parcels 1A and 1B and are slated to be transferred to the Novato Unified School District. The School District is working through the school sites program with the DTSC. The current schedule indicates they are slated for transfer early next year.

In August 2005 the Navy issued a Semi-annual Site Status Report and updated the Draft Human Health Risk Assessment. The Navy has been talking with the regulatory agencies about adding an additional well at the north-central portion of the MTBE plume. The details are still being worked out. The Navy turned off the biosparging system in March 2005 because it was no longer reducing concentrations. The Navy has been sampling on a monthly basis for six months. Based in the September data, the average concentrations are 81 percent lower than before the Navy started the biosparging system. Since we have turned the biosparging system off we have not seen any significant rebound.

Eric Bayer: Why do you want to add a new well?

Travis Williamson: The area where the Navy is being requested to add a new well is north, almost parallel to the landfill. The main reason is that we would like to have a secondary well further down gradient of the plume.

Eric Bayer: Since MTBE mixes with the groundwater, are there areas in the water column where there are higher concentrations?

Travis Williamson: We have five different well locations within the entire plume that are screened at separate depth intervals. One well is in the shallow interval of groundwater and one is deeper to determine if there is stratification of MTBE in the groundwater. We are not seeing any stratification based on our sampling results. There are intervals of soil below the groundwater table that are tighter than others. Most of the groundwater passes through coarser, sandier material rather than the tighter, less permeable material.

Matt McCarron: In the past, we have found that the depth of the MTBE plume is 10-12 feet below the ground surface. There are restrictions on the deed out there, and clearance has to be provided by the agencies for any digging to occur.

Eric Bayer: What is the regulatory limit for safe water?

Travis Williamson: It is pretty low, 13 parts per billion. Our highest concentration is 4500 ppb. The goal of the biosparging system was to decrease the hotspot concentrations. The final cleanup goal, which is clean drinking water, could take quite some time and will be achieved through natural attenuation, which has been found to occur on the site. The Navy has done numerous Risk Assessments and based on the concentrations that were here before the biosparging system, the property was suitable for its intended use.

Eric Bayer: What is the residential safe concentration? The drinking water concentration is 13 parts per billion.

Travis Williamson: The assumption was made that the residents would not be drinking the water. I cannot definitively tell you what that number would be.

Jim McAlister: The risk assessment is based on soil gas coming into contact with a person. A specific number depends on the conditions at the site.

Jim Davies: There is not a health risk on the site from inhalation of MTBE. We contacted a professor at UC Berkeley about the likelihood of fruit plants taking up MTBE and then exposing people to the chemical through the fruit. The model that was used previously to come to that conclusion was designed to analyze the impact of metals, not MTBE. The professor did not agree with the results of the previous study that concluded there might be risk. There is no risk of planting fruit trees.

Theresa McGarry: We put the restrictions on Hamilton meadows because we were also concerned about the construction workers. We never asked for a restriction on growing fruit trees because it was never conclusive that there was a risk, and we are taking a second look in the context of the Navy property slated for transfer to the Novato Unified School District.

Jim Davies: Hamilton Meadows has always been on the eastern edge of the plume and the concentrations have not been a concern.

Travis Williamson: Monitoring performed after the biosparging system was shutoff has shown that the MTBE values have decreased from the initial concentrations.

Joy Lanzaro: Can MTBE get into groundwater from surface runoff? How would you determine if the levels at minus five feet are coming from the plume or are coming from the top?

Travis Williamson: We don't do any sampling of stormwater runoff so we do not have the data to do that type of calculation. We have shown that concentrations in most of the areas of the plume are stable to decreasing. We have not observed increased concentrations of MTBE that could be attributed to runoff from cars.

Ballfields Parcel

The Navy completed sampling activities during the week of April 4th, which consisted of approximately 50 soil samples and 10 groundwater samples. The data was compared to conservative regulatory criteria and then the Navy prepared the Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection report. The report is currently being reviewed and we expect comments soon.

The property is ultimately going to be covered with fill material, and the Navy has presented a conclusion of no further action at this point.

Tom Gandesbery: If this property did not have fill on top, would you have to clean it up and do a removal action?

Travis Williamson: Without adjusting certain parameters that are incorporated into the ecological risk assessment and performing some statistical calculations, I cannot say for certain what the final estimated ecological risk would be, and whether those risks would warrant additional evaluation or removal.

Upcoming Actions

At the NEX Gas Station Site the Navy will be shifting from monthly to quarterly sampling of the biosparging performance wells and will continue to monitor natural attenuation throughout the MTBE plume. There will be a quarterly groundwater monitoring event in November. The Navy is also working on finalizing the Human Health Risk Assessment Update. For the Ballfields parcel, the Navy will be receiving regulatory comments on the Draft PA/SI Report and will develop responses to comments.

Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project Update- Tom Gandesbery, CSCC

The Corps currently has two levee building contracts underway at the north end of the project. The Project received BCDC and RWQCB permits over the summer. The Project has also received a Biological Opinion from USFWS. The Project is waiting for the Navy to finish BRAC work on the Ballfields Parcel so that it can be transferred next summer. The Corps has a schedule to bring dredged sediment to the site next fall. The Bel Marin Keys CSD is planning to pump its material to the site in the winter of 2006. The Corps will be hiring a public participation firm to assist with outreach.

Army BRAC Update: Ed Keller, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)

Documentation

- The Army distributed the Remedial Design Investigation report for Revetments 14, 19, 21, 22, 25, and 26 in May 2005 and has received conditional approval from the RWQCB. The report is now being revised based on the comments received from the RWQCB.
- The Remedial Action Workplan on Revetments 19, 21, 22, and 26 is also being revised based on the comments received from the RWQCB.
- The Remedial Design Investigation Workplan for the Skeet Range and Testing Range has been finalized and the Army has received conditional approval for the sampling. The testing range is located on the outboard levee and was used historically as a firing range.

Field Work

The Army has continued to sample at the range sites, and PAH and lead areas have been delineated at the Skeet Range.

The Army has completed excavations at Revetments 19, 22, and 26 and the sampling has indicated that there is some additional excavation needed at Revetment 21 which should be completed this month.

At the south runway DDT hotspot the soil haul-off is complete. All of the confirmation samples collected for the Building 35 DDT Removal were below the 1 ppm action goal and all of the soil has been removed. There has been quite a bit of soil movement. The coastal salt marsh soils were extremely wet and were placed in plastic-lined berms to dry out. The soils transportation and disposal is now almost complete, approximately 70 truckloads of soil still remain onsite. Additional excavation has been completed at the unlined perimeter drainage ditch and the soil characterization came back as Class II. This soil haul-off has also been completed.

Next Steps

The next step for the Army is to finalize the excavation plan at the testing range site and excavate with direct load and transport. The Army will prepare documentation to manage in place the Skeet Range Site, and will conduct another round of sampling at POL Hill this fall. We have been sampling the groundwater at POL Hill and all data has been coming in below residential cleanup goals. The Army will be requesting site closeout at POL Hill at the end of this year. The property has already been transferred to the City of Novato. There are about three more truckloads of soil to be removed from the revetments, and excavation should be completed in October. On the Coastal Salt Marsh, there about 70 truckloads left to go, which should wrap up this week. The access road in the coastal salt marsh will be graded and the Army will be monitoring the re-vegetation of the backfilled excavations. The vegetation appears to be coming back. The BRAC office should be closed early next year.

Matt McCarron: Did you do any stormwater confirmation?

Ed Keller: During the winter the soils were covered with plastic. We have a stormwater monitoring program in place.

Matt McCarron: Is there stormwater monitoring down at the outfall?

Ed Keller: Everything drains to the pump stations. We have stormwater monitoring at the two points where water is coming onto the property and where water is being discharged from. During the coastal salt marsh excavations, we also did some sampling in the outboard ditch.

Sue Lattanzio: Did you find anything?

Ed Keller: We didn't have any releases into the Bay. We had an upstream and a downstream sampling point. Beyond the limit of our excavation we sampled the water that would be downstream. The Army placed a dam through the ditch, using it as a settlement basin. We didn't find any noticeable difference between the upstream and downstream water in our sampling results.

The Army has one excavation left to go, which is the testing range. The Army just got the final bit of the sampling data in this week and we have been talking with the Water Board on those numbers. The location is right up against the levee, so it will be more difficult, because removing eight feet on the inboard side of a levee can be difficult, geologically speaking.

The sampling came back on the skeet range and didn't show that the Army's efforts had a lot of impact out there. The Army will be preparing some documentation showing management in place, and are discussing this with the Water Board.

Matt McCarron: For the next meeting is it possible that you could identify the sites where materials will be closed and kept in place?

Ed Keller: Sure.

Matt McCarron: What do you mean by stable in reference to keeping the soils in place?

Ed Keller: That is a good question. There is also a requirement for monitoring. On some parts of the site, areas that aren't in the wetland area will remain under three feet of cover. This is the reason that the Conservancy removed six of the revetment pads, because they were potentially in the scour area. The rest of the sites are either under concrete or around the perimeter of the site, which is being built up by the levee. So these areas will be buried underneath the levee.

Hugh Ashley: Tom, you mentioned the N2 levee and I am curious as to what will happen to the perimeter drainage ditch in relation to that levee.

Tom Gandesbery: All the stormwater gets pumped up over the levee and into the wetland. That has been designed into the project. During construction, it is a work around sort of thing. If the ditch is there we will use it, otherwise we will set up temporary pumps. There is a pump there, so there is some coordination that will have to be done about a temporary transfer.

Jim McAlister: Tom, what is the preferred option at the North Antennae Field?

Tom Gandesbery: We originally looked at having tidal channels across that area in the original EIS/EIR. In terms of NEPA/CEQA, we don't have to go back and revise the environmental analysis. The airfield has gone from conceptual design to design, and we are getting very close. We need to start the design for the antenna field. The Army Corps is going to have to develop a design for the antennae field.

Jim McAlister: The last documentation we had was the Supplemental EIR/EIS, and it seemed like you were discussing the preferred alternative for the final design in that document.

Tom Gandesbery: It was a preferred alternative in terms of the other three in that document. It refers mostly to what we do in the north end where there are homes. There were three alternatives in the document. The analysis stays the same even if the project details change slightly. The alternatives discussed in the document were at a conceptual level, and now we are working on design.

Jim McAlister: The schedule that I put up needs to be reexamined in light of this discussion and that the preferred alternative as stated in the Supplemental EIR/EIS does not appear to be what is actually being developed.

Tom Gandesbery: We have to get more into the design to see where we are getting our dredge material for the next eight years. It will take 5-8 years to fill up the air field. The design work should start soon. The pumping of the dredge material should start about this time next year, and so the design is further along.

Regulatory Update

Department of Toxic Substances Control-Theresa McGarry

Army Site - landfill 26: The Water Board is issuing a new set of orders and will be working with the Army and DTSC to determine what the next steps are, ultimately arriving at a Decision Document.

Navy Site: DTSC is looking at the Ballfields Site Preliminary Assessment and Site Inspection Report and feels that there needs to be some additional evaluation of the property or a further refinement of the current ecological risk assessment. There doesn't appear to be an issue with human health risks. However, we need further evaluation to ensure there is no significant risk to ecological receptors since this property will be developed into a wetland. DTSC is looking at land use covenants for portions of the gas station area to be transferred to the Novato School District (NSD) for a school site. The DTSC schools program will ultimately make the final determination on whether the property is safe for the school. The schools program will review the Navy's data and additional sampling data performed by the NSD's contractor to determine whether the property is suitable for a school. There will be groundwater restrictions, and possibly some digging restrictions on the portion of the property with petroleum residues. DTSC is also taking a look at Hamilton Square, formerly known as the Navy Sale Parcel. This property was transferred by the Navy with restrictions on residential use and groundwater use. It is not owned by the Navy, but the new owners are considering cleanup of the soil so they can remove the residential use restriction. They came to the department and asked if the DTSC would consider removing the restrictions and the DTSC did a voluntary cleanup agreement with them. They are also doing some public outreach to ensure a residential use is acceptable to the surrounding community before they expend funds to do the further cleanup.

Department of Toxic Substances Control-Lance McMahan

All military installations in the country have a spot that goes into the Annual Report to Congress on their actions. Part of that is something called a Management Action Plan. The Annual Report to Congress includes two sections. One is called the IRP Installation Restoration Program which is primarily contaminant issues and building demolition. The other is for the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP-Ordnance). The report includes programs that are underway and those that have been completed. You can go online and download the report. The report includes the money spent so far and what is budgeted for future years. Also included in the report is a list of all work to be completed. The Chemistry Element details how much money will be spent in FY07-FY11, a figure in the order of \$2 million. This is supposed to capture all removal actions, remedial action completions, and long-term operation and monitoring and costs.

There are four sites represented by this table. Hamilton Airfield includes Landfill 26, Lot 7 and the GSA Parcel. Lot 7 and GSA are what made the piles that are on the runway.

Ed Keller: Lot 7 was investigated separately, and is most of the southern area where the Southgate development is and part of Traditions and works its way up into the different

lots (8, 9 and 10). The GSA parcel includes Hamilton Meadows, the Marriot, and McDonalds.

Jim McAlister: Everything that abuts the levee. It includes all of the major portions where the developments are.

Jim McAlister: Does this table mix the FUDS and BRAC together?

Lance McMahan: The Formerly Used Defense site is the site which was transferred pre-October 1986. The Lot 7 and GSA Parcels were transferred in the 1990's and were bound to be contaminated. They needed to expedite the cleanup, so rather than use BRAC funds, FUDS money was used.

Jim McAlister: The Army declared the GSA parcels excess in the 1980's and they were put in caretaker status. The Department of Defense didn't want them, and then there was an act of Congress to clean up Hamilton by the Department of Defense, and the Department of Defense put the cleanup under the FUDS program. It didn't qualify as BRAC because the Department of Defense renounced ownership. The North Antennae Field is the only true FUDS site on Hamilton. Landfill 26 is still owned by the Army, the Air Force contributed \$15 million to the program for cleanup of the landfill because they were the last owners of the Landfill. The Department of Defense allocated that money to FUDS to do the cleanup.

Some of the removal action work that the DTSC has done in the North Antennae Field does not appear in the report, and we will be working to include that in 2005 report. The MMRP shows that there is nothing planned through FY11, so it appears there is a disconnect between the funding and the plan.

Jim McAlister: I can help to clarify that. We came to an agreement that the Archives Search Report (ASR) needs to be in the DTSC's hand before any action occurs.

The Corps is compiling the 2005 report now that will develop the Management Action Plan that will be released in early 2006. Our fiscal year ended September 30, 2005. The Management Action Plan provides an integrated, coordinated approach to dealing with the site now all the way to closure and a master schedule through completion. According to the Department of Defense, the Plan is updated annually with RAB input and placed in the information repository and in the administrative record. For more information, you can go to the Defense Environmental News and Exchange website. The Hamilton Management Action plan is being worked on currently, and the map should be finished within the next couple of months. If you are interested in getting a copy of the Hamilton Management Plan when it is finished, let me know and we will distribute the document appropriately.

Meeting wrap up and Adjournment- Matthew McCarron

Mr. McCarron announced that the next meeting will be held on January 11th, 2006